DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 437 SP 025 446

AUTHOR Defino, Maria E.
TITLE Teachers and Transitions: Two Case Studies of Teachers Changing Classroom Assignments in Mid-Year. Report No. 9056.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM Communication Services, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX 78712.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Learning; Case Studies; *Change Strategies; Classroom Techniques; *Developmental Stages; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; *Faculty Development; Learning Processes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teacher Transfer; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Two elementary school teachers were members of a large sample participating in a study of changing teacher practices through intervention with staff developers. In October, one teacher was transferred to a similar school in another part of the district. The other teacher accepted an assignment in another school at the end of the first semester. These schools had staff developers not participating in the larger study. Both teachers continued working with the Research in Teacher Education staff through an intervention with staff developers. The researchers explored teachers' stages of concern and teacher development; organizational change; teacher effectiveness; and contextual influence on teaching. Discussion of the two cases focuses on four central questions: (1) What were the teachers' personal and professional characteristics, and did these relate to perceptions of the initial class assignments? (2) Did the teachers change their classroom practice as a function of the multiple layers of change they experienced? (3) Who initiated the changes in classroom assignments, and how did the teachers feel about the changes? and (4) What contextual changes occurred as a result of the new assignments, and how (if at all) did these relate to the teachers' perceptions and practices? (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251437

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHERS AND TRANSITIONS: TWO CASE STUDIES OF TEACHERS CHANGING CLASSROOM ASSIGNMENTS IN MID-YEAR

Maria E. Defino

Report No. 9056

SP 025 446

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1984

TEACHERS AND TRANSITIONS: TWO CASE STUDIES OF TEACHERS CHANGING CLASSROOM ASSIGNMENTS IN MID-YEAR

Introduction

This paper is the result of an instance where reality interfered with a relatively elegant quasi-experimental research design focused upon effecting changes in teacher practice (Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, et al., 1982). Specifically, it presents two case studies of teachers whose classroom assignments changed, while they were in a study of changing teacher practice through an intervention which occurred at the staff developer level in their school district (Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983). Because the changes in assignments were not an intentional experimental manipulation, none of the research questions addressed here are truly a priori in nature. Rather they reflect the limitations of, and types of data collected by, the larger investigation (Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983; the reader is referred to that study for a comprehensive description of the intervention, participants, results, and so on).

Nonetheless, the cases represented a unique opportunity for exploration in the realm of educational change, and how such change is perceived and reacted to by those whom it impacts. A variety of questions about the people and their circumstances naturally arose: (1) What were the teachers' personal and professional characteristics, and how did these relate (if at all) to perceptions of the initial class assignments? (2) Did the teachers change their classroom practice as a function of the multiple layers of change which they experienced? (3) Who initiated the changes in classroom assignments, and how did the teachers feel about the changes? (4) What contextual changes occurred as a result of the new assignments, and how (if at all) did these relate to the teachers' perceptions and practices?

Discussion of the two cases will be focused towards these four central questions.

Review of Pertinent Literature

A number of theoretical points of view may be brought to bear upon the raw data comprising the two cases, thereby maximizing their informational yield in terms of the above questions and their potential for utility in further research and practice. Among these are four major theoretical/research frameworks which seem particularly useful: teachers' stages of concern and teacher development; organization change; teacher effectiveness; and, contextual influences upon teaching. Therefore, the brief review of selected literature which follows is organized to reflect these four bodies of theory and research.

Teacher Development

One growing body of literature indicates that teachers may be viewed as adult learners, with learner characteristics assuming importance in understanding and managing the staff development process. Recently, for example, Christensen, Burke, Fessler, and Hagstrom (1983) documented the growing trend of inservice education for teachers to take into account emerging knowledge regarding adult development. The authors concluded that "Inservice programs that fail to address the intellectual and emotional needs of teachers who participate in them...may actually undermine themselves" (Forward). To succeed, the authors indicated that specific staff development activities be created to match the teacher as an adult learner; they cite a number of earlier works in support of this contention (Burden, 1981; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Katz, 1972; Ryan, 1979; Santmire, 1981; Unruh & Turner, 1970; Watts, 1980; all reported in Christensen, et al., 1983).

Consistent with the above line of reasoning, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) provides a structure for staff development planning which focuses on the process of change as a personal experience (Hall & Loucks, 1978; 1979). The perceptions and motivations expressed by teachers about particular innovations may be identified and classified according to a developmental scheme of stages. A teacher's movement through these stages is an integral part of the change process with regard to an innovation; by attending to each teacher's progression, full implementation of an innovation can be facilitated by a staff developer. A central tenet to add is that, according to the model, teachers are perceived generally to need support as they experience change.

Seven developmental stages of concern through which individuals in an organizational context pass with regard to any given innovation have been established (Hall, Wallace, & Dossett, 1973). These range from a starting level of little concern and awareness, through a general awareness, to concern over personal effects of the innovation, on to concerns about management and consequences of the innovation, then to concern about possibilities of collaboration in using the innovation, and finally to the highest stage where the concern is focused on an exploration of more universal benefits to be derived from the innovation. In order for a staff development effort to be deemed "appropriate," and therefore of utility to the individual, the teachers' particular concerns need to be identified and acknowledged. Thus, it seems important to consider available evidence indicative of the two teachers' stages of concern, as well as other possibly salient individual learner characteristics, when reviewing their cases.

Organization Development and Change

Although organization change research in the context of American public schools appears limited (see Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983), there does seem to have been established a preliminary core of useful information for both researchers and practitioners. Two major research efforts, in particular, are central to contemporary change/staff development literature: the study conducted by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. (I/D/E/A; Bentzen, 1974), and the Rand Corporation study of federal programs supporting educational change (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Although it is not possible to fully report on either study in a paper of this scope, a brief review of some of the most pertinent findings will be helpful.

In particular, an activity pattern emerged in the findings of the I/D/E/A study whereby institutional receptivity to change could be identified (dialogue, shared decision-making, taking action based on shared decisions, and evaluation of the action, or DDAE). Goodlad's notion (in Bentzen, 1974, p. viii) that teachers need to learn to "think together, plan together, decide together and act together" as a means of learning to help themselves is typical of this pattern. Findings from the I/D/E/A study also indicated that those who intervene in school systems and buildings had difficulty with shifting their expectations, accepting the school staff and treating them "with dignity" (Bentzen, 1974, p. 201). Additionally, a peer group strategy based upon the DDAE process (as distinct from interventions led by "outsiders") was recommended as an effective means of bringing about change, such that genuinely open, bi-directional communication between teachers and principals with administrative support from the system could create "positive" pressure towards desired change. Feiman-Nemser (1983)

reports, however, that school norms often mitigate against collegial interaction, and particularly against the scrutiny and discussion of practice by teachers.

The Rand study (as reported in Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983) also brought renewed emphasis to the teachers involved in change efforts. Among the findings of interest, it was noted that career teachers with many years of classroom teaching experience were less likely to change their own practice; project cost did not seem to be a factor in eliciting changes in teachers' practice; and, the teachers' "sense of efficacy," or their attitude about their own professional competency, was strongly and positively related to all of the project's outcome measures. Even in describing the apparently critical process of mutual adaptation, whereby an intervention "is adapted to the reality of its institutional setting, while at the same time teachers and school officials adapt their practices in response to the project," (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. viii), the teachers' centrality to effecting change in their own behaviors and practices is noted: "...the process that fosters effective implementation and teacher change is one that promotes each teacher's ability, capacity, and motivation to accomplish this unique tuning [adaptation]." (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. 17).

The Rand study also contributed to an understanding of several aspects of effective staff development. When these were "well-executed" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 29-30), they had substantial positive effects on change outcomes:

(1) teacher training which was concrete, teacher-specific, and on-going, including attempts to make the change effort "fit" the local settings better;

(2) technical assistance in the classroom;

(3) opportunities to observe and consult with other teachers involved in the change effort;

(4) regular meetings focused on solving substantive and practical problems (vs. administrative/procedural issues);

(5) participation by teachers in decision-making required by the change effort;

(6) development of support materials by persons in the local setting; and,

(7) involvement on the part of the building principals in preparing for and putting into effect the change effort.

On the basis of findings from these two major research projects, the I/D/E/A study and the Rand study, attention seems warranted to information in these two teachers' cases about the following: how the changes in their classroom assignments were made; how professionally effective each of the individuals felt; how much prior classroom experience they had; how they perceived the staff development activities in which they engaged, and whether or not they adapted information, materials, and so on received through staff development to suit their own needs and settings; and finally, whether or not they worked collaboratively with other teachers, administrators, and/or other staff in relation to either the planned or the unanticipated interventions made in their work during the school year.

Teacher Effectiveness

Although nearly everyone can remember a teacher or two encountered during formal schooling that might be referred to as "effective," research into teacher effectiveness has taken a highly focused viewpoint. Thus, certain specific teaching/classroom behaviors have been identified as being

positively related to higher student achievement test scores. Research also has indicated that student achievement is related to on-task behavior of students. These types of research investigations constitute the bulk of what is commonly referred to as "teacher effectiveness research" (Medley, 1979). Operationally, as a result of the typical procedure of correlating particular teacher/student behaviors with student performance on standardized reading and mathematics tests, the effective teacher is one whose classes regularly score higher on such tests than do classes of other teachers, after statistically controlling for pre-existing or "entering" differences among them (Brophy & Evertson, 1974; Good & Grouws, 1977, 1979; Stallings, Needels, & Stayrook, 1979). Limitations of such a narrow approach, and necessary precautions regarding interpretation and application of these correlational research findings, have been described elsewhere (e.g., Barnes, 1981; Brophy & Evertson, 1974; and Good, 1981).

Generally, Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al. (1983) and Barnes (1981, 1983) have indicated that effective teachers in exemplary studies (e.g., Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1974; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Evertson, Emmer, & Brophy, 1980; Good & Grouws, 1977; Good & Grouws, 1979; Soar & Soar, 1972; Stallings, 1978; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974; Stallings, Needels, & Stayrook, 1979) tended to establish a classroom atmosphere that was warm and supportive yet also work-oriented. The effective teachers were organized and emphasized efficient classroom procedures and management. Such teachers also remained actively involved with students during class time to prevent misbehavior, and promptly intervened to halt instances of misbehavior which did occur. Certain behavior patterns during instructional presentation tended to characterize the effective teachers: gaining students' attention before starting;

clarity in presentation of content; having students practice newly acquired skills; monitoring student performance and providing feedback; assigning individual seatwork; and, evaluating student performance. Effective teachers also generally interacted with the whole class during class time, and moved students through discussions at a brisk pace with a high level of student success.

Because sufficient research has been completed to establish sets of behavior patterns associated with effective teachers, and because this knowledge was intended to be integrated into the content of staff development provided to the two teachers described in this paper, it seems critical to examine their classroom teaching for evidence of these behaviors. Special attention must be given to the points in time where the change in classroom assignments occurred, as both common sense and some research evidence indicate that teaching behaviors interact with grade level, subject matter, and pupil characteristics (Brophy & Evertson, 1974).

Contextual Influences Upon Teaching

According to Griffin, Hughes, Barnes, et al., (1982, p. 50), "It is now axiomatic that the contexts in which people live and work are instrumental in shaping and modifying behaviors." Influences of context have been recognized as salient in the particular realms of teacher education (e.g., Barnes & Defino, 1982; Defino, Barnes, & O'Neal, 1982; Griffin & Edwards, 1982); teacher behavior (Barnes, 1981, 1983; Defino, 1982; Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983); and staff development and school change efforts (Bentzen, 1974; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Edwards, 1981; and Little, 1982). Feiman-Nemser (1983, p. 10) even allows perceptions of context to assume a determinant role in teacher decision-making: "Formal knowledge can provide

ways of thinking and alternative solutions, but teachers must decide what their specific situation requires."

Possible immediate contextual influences of significance in the present case studies would include school size, class size, pupil ethnicities, pupil socioeconomic status (SES), and grade level in both the initial assignments and the later assignments these teachers received. System-level contextual influences may also be of significance in interpreting the cases.

Historical Context of the Cases

Teachers A and B, as they will be referred to in this text (for purposes of anonymity only; no qualitative inferences should be made), were members of a larger sample participating in a study of changing teacher practices through an intervention with staff developers. (See Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983, for a complete description of the study.) Each teacher worked with a different staff developer, although both staff developers participated in the intervention, that is, were in the "treatment group." Consequently these staff developers were knowledgeable of both effective teaching strategies and effective processes in eliciting and promoting changes in teacher practices. All of these persons worked in a large city school district which was under a court order to raise the achievement test scores of its school children.

In October, Teacher A was transferred to a similar school in another part of the district because of shifting enrollments in her program. A staff developer not participating in the study was assigned to that school. Thus, Teacher A was exposed to the content and processes of the intervention during staff development activities which occurred during only the first month or so of the school year.

On the other hand, Teacher B had requested a new position in another building in August. At the end of the first semester she was offered, and chose to accept, her new assignment for January. This assignment was also in a school with a staff developer not participating in the study.

Both Teachers A and B agreed to continue working with the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) staff despite the changed assignments and staff developers. Therefore, fairly complete sets of data (in terms of participant requirements for the larger study) were obtained.

Methods

Procedures

As per teachers in the larger study, Teachers A and B were asked to share a broad array of information with RITE. Both teachers completed demographic questionnaires and responded to open-ended questionnaires at the start of the school year. Both teachers were scheduled to be observed for a total of twelve hours during reading and mathematics at three points during the school year (four hours per teacher, two one-hour observations per subject, at the beginning of the year, mid-semester, and in January). Finally, both teachers kept personal journals of their staff development activities and interactions.

Instrumentation

Demographic questionnaire. This two-page structured questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of 16 items. The first three items pertained to the participants' personal characteristics: sex, age bracket, and ethnicity. Remaining items requested information about (1) the respondents' professional background, (2) current professional status/job title, and (3) the settings in which the respondents worked, both previously and at present. Thus, questions were asked about, for example, their years of

previous classroom teaching; years in current position; where and when college degrees were obtained and in what areas of concentration; additional professional responsibilities; memberships in professional organizations; and the socioeconomic status (SES) and ethnicities of students in the schools where these individuals worked. Because of the time of administration, responses are reflective of the schools where the teachers worked initially.

Teacher questionnaire. A teacher questionnaire (Appendix B) was administered to teachers at the beginning of the school year. This questionnaire provided evidence of teachers' plans for the beginning of school, determined teachers' confidence in their ability to teach their assigned students and curriculum, and tapped their thoughts regarding their students' ability to learn. Again, these pertain to the teaching assignments which Teachers A and B held at the start of the school year.

Barnes Teacher Observation Instrument (BTOI). The Barnes Teacher Observation Instrument (Appendix C) was used by RITE staff members and other trained observers to observe classroom teachers for evidence of the desired teaching behaviors targeted through the staff development intervention. The observations focused on teaching behaviors which constitute these statistical factors on the instrument: planning and preparation, presentation of content, interactions, conducting practice, conducting seatwork, holding students responsible for assignments, organizing the classroom, presentation of rules or procedures, holding students responsible for behavior, and reacting to student behavior.

The record of observed teacher behaviors documents the frequency of desired behaviors, as well as the naturally-occurring sequences of these behaviors. After training in the use of the instrument, classroom observers

noted the occurrence of the effective behaviors on a coding sheet. The coding sheet tallies were then transferred to magnetic tape for analysis. (The reader is referred to Barnes, 1983, and Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983, for a full description of the nature, uses, and statistical qualities of this instrument.)

Summary Paragraphs. In part because of the realization that coding behaviors represents a selective view of classroom events, observers were asked to record short paragraphs on a blank form (Appendix D) immediately after conducting each observation. In these, observers were instructed to note the following sorts of qualitative information in their best professional judgment: (1) critical incidents which might have affected the flow and/or the interpretation of coded behaviors on the BTOI; (2) behavior patterns on the part of teachers or students which were noteworthy, particularly if they might not have been immediately evident in the BTOI coding; and, (3) the observer's overall impression of the general atmosphere in the classroom.

Teachers' journals. Teachers were asked to keep a written account of each interaction with their respective staff developers. They were asked to include, as a minimum, information about the type of interaction, the content and outcomes. (See Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983, for a full description). Inclusion of other relevant information not specifically requested in the guidelines was encouraged. Despite the changes in staff developers, Teachers A and B were asked to continue recording such interactions with the new staff developers in their journals. In this manner documentation of events, at least from the teachers' perspectives, was obtained.

Data Analysis

No statistical tests of data were made in preparing these two cases. In some instances, such as with the BTOI data, arithmetic averages were calculated and are reported. The means in all cases are reported for the ten factors on the BTOI. Numerous discrete behaviors were found statistically to form fairly distinct clusters, matching their organization on the instrument by its author (see Appendix C of Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983 for a presentation of the BTOI factor analysis). Thus, the mean rates for each of the discrete behaviors were utilized in the calculation of the means for each factor, and it is important to keep in mind the multiple indicators which contributed to each factor mean. All factor means reported for the BTOI are mean behavior rates per hour of observation. Subject matter was treated as a variable, such that mean rates of behaviors observed during reading and mathematics instruction are reported separately. In one instance, no mathematics instruction occurred during the observations even though two hours of observation were scheduled for this purpose.

When both possible and reasonable, data pertaining to Teachers A and B are reflected back against each other and against data drawn from the larger sample of teachers in the Changing Teacher Practice study.

Findings

Participant Characteristics

In relation to the first broad question, results from the demographic questionnaire (displayed in Table 1) furnish brief portraits of Teachers A and B. An overall image of considerable initial similarity emerges. Both women were between 30-39 years of age at the time of the study. Both began

Table 1. Summary of Demographic Information

	Teacher A	Teacher B
Sex	F	F
Age Group	30-39	30-39
Ethnicity	Hispanic	Anglo
Grade level at start	3-bilingual	5
Newly assigned grade level	1/2-bilingual	5/6-gifted
Years at starting grade level	0	0
Prior grade levels taught	K, 3, 6, 2	6
Years of prior experience	2½	5
Prior schools	3 schools in 3 districts	all in same school
Degrees	State University B.S., Liberal Arts	State University B.A., Social Science, Private University, M.A., Education
Additional credits	0	40 units
Current degree work	No	No
Other professional responsibilities	None	None
Student SES (starting assignment)	Low	Low
Student ethnicities (starting assignment)	Anglo 20% Asian 30% Black 20% Hispanic 30%	Not available
School size (# pupils in starting assignment)	Less than 500	600
Professional memberships	None	Local, state, and National Education Association

the school year teaching at a new grade level assignment. Both had received Bachelor of Arts degrees from the same state institution. Neither was currently working towards an advanced degree or had additional professional responsibilities outside the classroom. Both began the year teaching in relatively small schools, with students from predominantly low income and ethnic minority families.

The teachers were different from one another in some respects, however. Teacher A began the year teaching a bilingual third grade class; Teacher B started in a fifth grade class. Teacher A was transferred into a combination first/second grade bilingual class in a similar school (according to her journal and observer reports); Teacher B accepted a position teaching a combination fifth/sixth grade gifted class in a school with predominantly upper-middle class Anglo children (as reported in her journal). Teacher A seems to have had more varied teaching experience than Teacher B; although Teacher A had about three years of classroom experience, she had taught at four different grade levels in three different school districts. In contrast, Teacher B had taught at two grade levels (when the current one is included), all in the same school building during her five-year career. Also, Teacher B had earned credits beyond her Master's degree and was a member of local, state, and national education organizations; Teacher A did not report having graduate credits or memberships in professional organizations.

Teacher Questionnaires

Also in partial response to the first research question, the teachers' perceptions of their facility in teaching, and of their students' in learning, were tapped by the open-ended questionnaire (see the summary in Table 2). Because the questionnaire was administered early in the fall,

Table 2. Summary of Teachers' Responses to the Questionnaire

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
1. Confidence in teaching subjects of curriculum	"very confident in ... spelling, language, reading, and math, and if I had time social studies" because "I am given everything" through (special district program).	"Quite confident in reading, math, language, spelling -- less so in science, social studies"
2. Confidence in teaching all types of students	"... so I have to be able to teach all types of students."	"Quite confident with high and low kids -- not so much with kids with learning disabilities"
3. Confidence in students ability to learn curriculum	"My students will learn because the time allotted for each subject is planned ..."	"½ to 2/3 of kids are capable -- some of kids are three years below grade level ... this poses problems across the curriculum..."
4a. Desired and undesired student attitudes	Desired Attitudes "Respectful, Confidence, Optimistic, Future oriented, Good concept of 'time'" Undesired Attitudes "Disrespectful, self-destructive, self-centered"	Desired Attitudes "Wanting to learn, enthusiasm, and general courtesy to all" Undesired Attitudes "The opposites (of above)"
4b. How communicated	"go over the rules of the school, the class ... tell them the consequences of not following the rules."	"... communicated by me through statements on standards and discussions of proper classroom behavior."

Table 2. continued

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
5a. Desired and undesired student behaviors	Desired Behaviors "Good listening, quiet, alert, courteous, enthusiastic, helpful."	Desired Behaviors "completion of work, quiet working habits, consideration for others (not making fun of others, keeping hands to self)"
	Undesirable Behaviors "Time wasting, talking incessantly, bullying other students, making fun of others."	Undesirable Behaviors "Opposites (of the above)"
5b. How communicated	(No response)	"Same way (as in 4b, above)"
6. Personal long range learning goals for students	"... Reading at grade level when they leave my class ... able to follow directions ... be fully familiar and confident with (district program) format."	"Math, language, reading - 5th grade curriculum"
7. School goals	"Students will complete 12 Units of Math instruction and show mastery of their grade level ... will read and complete at least 3 Reading levels during school year ... will complete all Spelling and Language Units. Plus Unit Tests ... will participate in Math, Physical Ed. and Science Labs."	"Court order from judge stated that we need to raise scores of our students (an almost totally minority school) a certain amount each year ..."
8. District goals	"Follow the (district) format and have over 50% of students at grade level in Reading, Math, Spelling, and Language by testing time. Plus 100 minutes of Physical Education per week."	"Same (as above)"

Table 2. continued

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
9. Amount and kinds of instructional planning	"a) Seating of students in groups... b) Making sure I have all materials needed ... c) Rereading of the guides to make sure I know what to emphasize..."	"(District program) has activities for instruction pretty much mapped out. There is not too much need for planning of actual lessons -- more attention is needed to the actual time periods, to keep 'on-task' and to fit everything in during the day."
10a. Factors in decision-making	"Age of students, grade level, reading level, maturity ..., attitudes ..."	"Trial and error - what works for me and the kids"
10b. Student preferences	"Yes, when we have a group decision to make ... I look to see whether the students seem happy to be in my class."	"Not too much. Occasionally I'll give kids choice of activities. These kids need strong discipline and structure -- telling rather than asking works better for me."
11. Planned academic time	"Math 60 min ... Reading 90 min ... Vocabulary 10 min Language 30 min Spelling 20 min Science Vocab. 15 min ESL 40 min ... PE/or Science 30 min"	"Reading - 1½ hours/day ... Math - 1 hour Spelling - 20 min Language - ½ to 3/4 hr P. E. - 20 min Everything else ... "
12. Assess student abilities at start of year	"Math Survey Tests. (Local) Quick Reading assessment. ESL Placement Tests. Observation. Assignments ..."	"Reading - Ginn Level Comprehension test & (Local) Quick reading test. Reading levels seem to reflect most other subject areas. Math - all kids do 5th grade math."

Table 2. continued.

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
13a. Student awareness of homework	"... show them ... hand it out to them ... look at it. I ask if anyone has a question ... I do an example on the board ... ask them to tell me when the homework will be due."	"Pass it out just before dismissing or discuss it orally."
13b. Student awareness of classwork	"Tell them ahead of time what we will be doing ... and what I will be collecting at the end of the day."	"Assignments written in various places on the board."
14a. & b. Student awareness of grading criteria	"Yes ... acceptable and well done it earns a star, if ... passable a check mark and if unacceptable they have to do the work over."	"Yes -- explaining on board. How many missed would be A, A-, B+, B-. Also how I average grades for report cards is shown. They all know how to find averages so they do their own for spelling after 4 weeks."
15a. & b. Unfinished and make-up work	"Yes ... take unfinished work home for homework. If not ... will do it during free time plus ... told that this kind of behavior will lead to a [parent] conference..."	"Yes. Homework is made up. If Reading or Math isn't done, I talk privately with kid about [it]... and how I had better also discuss it with parent. If this persists I check ... before recess and have kids work during recess or after school."
16. Class rules	"1. Work quietly. 2. Raise hand for help. 3. No eating candy or chewing gum in class."	"1. Follow directions. 2. Stay in seat unless permission to leave. 3. Rai e hand to talk. 4. Keep hands to self. 5. Enter and leave room quietly."

both teachers' responses regarding the students may be presumed to reflect their initial teaching assignments. Again, the similarity across these two persons' remarks is most evident.

In particular, both teachers felt "quite" or "very confident" of their teaching abilities in the varying subjects, especially reading, mathematics, spelling, and language arts. When asked about their confidence in teaching all types of students in their classrooms, Teacher A indicated that she had to be able to teach all types of students while Teacher B identified herself as confident with most students, but perhaps less so with children who had learning disabilities. The teachers' notions of their students' capability of learning the curriculum varied slightly: Teacher A indicated that her students would learn the curriculum due to the carefully planned sequences of activities and time allotments, while Teacher B felt that most of her students were capable of learning the curriculum--except for those who were very far below grade level in reading (e.g., being three years behind in reading "...poses problems across the curriculum").

Moving out of the academic realm and into the social/behavioral aspects of classroom life, both Teachers A and B reported largely similar student behaviors and attitudes as being desirable ("quiet," "quiet working habits," "courteous," "consideration for others") and undesirable ("making fun of others"). The overlap in responses is most noticeable when the distinction imposed by the questionnaire, between behaviors and attitudes, is dropped (i.e., what one teacher considered a behavior, the other may have thought of as an attitude). Both teachers indicated they took responsibility for communicating desired behaviors and attitudes to the students by telling them and/or discussing rules with them during class time. Teacher A

additionally reported informing students of consequences for not following rules.

The teachers' responses to the question about their long range goals for their students were both brief and similar. One teacher's goal was to complete the grade-level curriculum, while the other wanted students to know how to do things (e.g., follow directions) as well as be at grade level (e.g., to have gone through the curriculum) by the end of the year. The teachers described their respective school-level goals for students in different terms. One referred to the court order regarding required increments in student achievement test scores, while the other referred to the completion of various amounts and kinds of work. Finally, in reference to school district goals, both teachers referred to student achievement test score increases.

The next few questions concerned teacher planning and decision-making. Both Teachers A and B noted more or less directly that the particular district academic achievement program in effect (see Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, et al., 1983 for more information about this) eliminated much of the planning and decision-making often associated with teaching due to its prescriptive and rigidly sequential nature: "I am given everything," and "... activities for instruction [are] pretty much mapped out. There is not too much need for planning of actual lessons ..." Thus, Teacher A's planning consisted of deciding how to seat students, checking her materials, and re-reading her guides. Teacher B noted that she attended more to management of instruction ("actual time periods, to keep on-task," etc.). Teachers A and B responded differently to the question about factors entering into their decision-making: Teacher A specified a variety of student characteristics, while B went with "what works" on a "trial and

error" basis (no criteria for knowing when something "works" were specified). Both teachers reported some limited consideration of student preferences and opinions in their decision-making and selection of instructional activities. Reflective of district-level requirements, both teachers generated very similar planned time allotments per subject area in their daily schedules. The teachers also indicated reliance upon several bits of information in assessing their students' abilities at the start of the year, although Teacher A listed a greater number of discrete sources. Both mentioned tests, and both specifically mentioned a locally-developed reading test.

In responding to the next questions regarding classwork, homework, work completion, and grading, some differences in the teachers' responses were noted. Teacher A reported having a routine involving several steps which she used in making students aware of homework, whereas Teacher B relied on either of two basic strategies. Interestingly, with regard to classwork, Teacher A reported "telling" students what they were to do and what would be collected, while Teacher B wrote assignments on the chalkboard. Both teachers believed they had made their students aware of grading criteria; Teacher A explained her three-symbol system without stating how the students had learned the significance of the symbols, and Teacher B reported having explained her marking system on the board. With regard to unfinished and make-up work, both teachers noted a series of steps they would take with students who failed to complete work, including loss of free time and parent conferences.

Finally, both Teachers A and B furnished RITE with a list of their classroom rules (see Item 16 in Table 2). One had three rules, the other

had five; all were fairly short and to the point. Also, there was some duplication across the lists with regard to hand raising and being quiet.

Classroom Observations

The ten factors from the BTOI classroom observations were: academic planning and preparation, academic presentation, academic interactions, practice, seatwork, holding students responsible for assignments, classroom organization and rules, teaching rules and procedures, holding students responsible for behavior (including use of established rules and procedures), and teacher reactions to student behaviors. The reader is referred to Barnes (1983) for a comprehensive description of discrete behaviors which are collapsed into these ten factors (see also Appendix C, where all 112 discrete behaviors are listed under the factor headings on the instrument). The factors are presented in Table 3; findings pertaining to each will be reviewed in turn. In partial response to the third major research question, patterns in each teacher's behavior over time (Times 1-3), within factors and within subject matter (reading or mathematics), will be noted. Next, comparisons will be made between each teacher's factor means across time and subject matter, and the ten overall factor means for the larger sample of all teachers (see Table 4). It should be remembered that Teacher A was observed in her new setting at Time 2, while teacher B was in her new assignment at Time 3. Teacher A had been teaching in her new setting for one week when the Time 2 observations occurred, whereas Teacher B had been in her new assignment for two weeks when the Time 3 observations were conducted.

Academic planning and preparation (Factor 1). Teacher statements (written or oral) regarding academic assignments, time to be spent doing work in the various subjects, and the like, were coded here.

Table 3. Mean Rates Per Hour of BTOI Factors* by Subjects Being Taught and Observation Times for Teachers A and B, Respectively

Teacher A

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Factor 9	Factor 10
Math	Time 1	.46	1.36	3.62	.57	.68	.20	.25	.83	.27	.44
	Time 2	0	1.10	1.03	0	.55	0	0	0	0	.24
	Time 3	0	2.05	4.15	0	0	1.66	0	0	0	1.63
Reading	Time 1	0	1.11	2.44	0	.60	.33	.60	.14	.05	.98
	Time 2	.17	1.45	1.04	0	.05	.32	.32	.12	.29	1.27
	Time 3	.11	.86	1.55	.15	1.33	.29	0	0	.32	1.01
	$\bar{x}$ =	.12	1.32	2.30	.12	.56	.47	.20	.18	.16	.93

Teacher B

Math	**Time 1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Time 2	0	4.12	3.81	2.09	0	.80	1.72	0	.47	2.02
	Time 3	.30	2.02	.88	.50	2.48	1.01	.30	.58	.32	1.25
Reading	Time 1	.29	4.10	2.72	.32	.44	.25	.86	1.04	.77	.78
	Time 2	.29	3.17	2.69	0	0	2.12	2.31	0	.70	1.90
	Time 3	.55	1.87	1.16	0	.31	.40	2.18	.67	.30	.27
	$\bar{x}$ =	.28	3.06	2.25	.58	.65	.92	1.48	.46	.51	1.25

* The reader is reminded that several discrete mean behavior rates were utilized in calculating each factor mean rate.

**No mathematics instruction by Teacher B was observed at Time 1.

Table 4. A Comparison of BTOI Factor Means* for Teacher A and Teacher B to the Factor Means of All Teachers Across Time and Subject Matter

	BTOI Factors	Grand Means, All Teachers	Standard Deviation	Factor Mean, Teacher A	Factor Mean, Teacher B
1.	Academic Planning and Preparation	.36	.42	.12	.28
2.	Academic Presentation	2.46	1.44	1.32	3.06
3.	Academic Interactions	3.00	2.64	2.30	2.25
4.	Practice	.42	.90	.12	.58
5.	Seatwork	.84	1.26	.56	.65
6.	Holding Students Responsible for Assignments	.72	.60	.47	.92
7.	Organizes/Rules and Procedures for Classroom	.66	.84	.20	1.48
8.	Teaching Rules and Procedures	.30	.60	.18	.46
9.	Holding Students Responsible for Behavior	.60	.42	.16	.51
10.	Reacting to Student Behavior	1.56	1.02	.93	1.25

* The reader is reminded that several discrete mean behavior rates were utilized in calculating each factor mean rate.

Teacher A was observed at Time 1 to be demonstrating some behaviors in this category while conducting mathematics instruction, but no such behaviors were coded later in the year (Times 2 or 3) during mathematics. This represents a decrease of more than one standard deviation (see Table 4) over Time. A different pattern was noted in her reading instruction, whereby no codable academic planning and preparation behaviors were observed at Time 1; the highest mean rate within reading occurred at Time 2; and a slightly lower rate was observed at Time 3. The latter rates were both low, and none of the differences in reading over Time were larger than the standard deviation for the entire sample (see Table 4).

Teacher B was not observed while conducting mathematics instruction at Time 1 (even though two hours of observation were conducted for this purpose). Unlike Teacher A, this teacher changed her observed behavior during mathematics lessons from Time 2 to Time 3--the mean rate of planning and preparation behavior increased. Teacher B's reading instruction was observed at all three times; while it did not change from September to mid-October, an increase similar to that in mathematics from October to January occurred for reading lessons, also. At both Times 2 and 3, however, Teacher B's mean rate of coded behaviors in academic planning were higher for reading than for mathematics. Again, none of these differences were larger than one standard deviation.

bTOI factor means across time and subject matter for academic planning and preparation in both teachers' cases were within one standard deviation of the mean for all teachers.

Academic presentation (Factor 2). A variety of active instructional behaviors by teachers are included in this factor. For example, teacher presentation of new information, references to past and/or future academic

activities, and use of concrete examples or demonstrations would all be included here.

The means for academic presentation by Teacher A show what could be considered random fluctuations, because no differences in the means over time represent an amount larger than one standard deviation. It can be noted, however, that her observed mean at Time 3 in reading was more than one standard deviation below the grand mean (see Tables 3 and 4). However, Teacher B's academic presentation behaviors did show a pattern which might be indicative of an interaction with time. From Time 2 to Time 3 in mathematics, her rate of academic presentation decreased by a value greater than one standard deviation. In reading also, her rates of presentation declined steadily from Time 1 to Time 3, such that the difference between Times 1 and 3 was greater than one standard deviation. As a final note of interest, her observed mean rates of presentation at Time 2 in mathematics and at Time 1 in reading were more than one standard deviation above the mean.

When each teacher's mean rate of presentation is calculated across time and subject matter, however, neither one is "significantly" different (in the non-statistical sense of being more than one standard deviation away) from the mean for all teachers in the sample across time and subject matter. However, it is interesting to note that the category means of the two teachers are more than one standard deviation apart from each other, with Teacher B having the higher rate of academic presentation behaviors.

Academic interactions (Factor 3). Behaviors such as the teacher asking "process" or "product"-type questions, and accepting questions and comments from students during reading and mathematics lessons were coded in this BTOI factor.

Teacher A's mean rates of academic interactions reveal a pattern of interaction with Time during mathematics lessons. Her observed rate of interaction behaviors dropped by nearly one standard deviation from Time 1 to Time 2, but then increased by more than one standard deviation from Time 2 to Time 3. Her mean rates of academic interactions in reading lessons showed a "high-low-medium" pattern over time, although the shifts were far less dramatic (all within one standard deviation of each other).

Teacher B showed a pattern of decreased academic interactions with her pupils over time during both mathematics and reading lessons. The drop from Time 2 to Time 3 in mathematics is the most dramatic, and again is a value greater than the standard deviation.

The two teachers' mean rates of academic interactions calculated across time and subject matter are very close in value (within .05 of each other). Also, both teachers' factor means are within one standard deviation of the mean for all teachers across time and subject.

Practice (Factor 4). The kinds of classroom behaviors coded as practice on the BTOI are limited to teacher-directed, whole group practice of either new or old material, generally after the teacher has presented or reviewed the content for about 10 or 15 minutes.

The most obvious remark which can be made about Teacher A's use of practice, in either mathematics or reading instruction, is that it rarely occurred. The same can be said for Teacher B's use of practice during reading instruction. Teacher B was observed to have utilized practice during both observations of mathematics instruction. At Time 2 her rate was nearly two standard deviations above the mean, but the mean rate dropped substantially from Time 2 to Time 3 (by a little more than 1½ standard deviations). Relative to the category mean rate of practice observed on the

part of all teachers, across time and subject matter, Teachers A and B were not radically different (both to each other and to the larger sample).

Seatwork (Factor 5). Certain teacher and student behaviors which occurred while pupils were working individually at their desks on an assignment given to the whole group, such as providing individual assistance or monitoring the class, were included in this factor.

Teacher A's mean rate of seatwork behaviors in mathematics lessons declined to zero over Times 1, 2, and 3. In reading instruction, her use of seatwork dropped to near zero from Time 1 to Time 2, but increased by one standard deviation from Time 2 to Time 3. Conversely, Teacher B's mean rate of observed seatwork behaviors in mathematics lessons increased by about two standard deviations from Time 2 (no occurrence) to Time 3. She generally used seatwork less often in reading instruction, and dropped to zero at Time 2 in reading as well as in math.

In examining the mean seatwork rates of each teacher over time and subject matter, relative to the mean rate of all teachers, no major differences were observed.

Holding students responsible for assignments (Factor 6). Behaviors such as the teacher telling students that they were to complete an assignment, that assignments would be checked, and relating students' work to their grades were all coded within this BTOI factor.

Teacher A began the year in mathematics by demonstrating a low mean rate of behaviors in this factor, then dropped to zero at Time 2, and finally increased her use of such behaviors by more than two standard deviations at Time 3. In contrast, she maintained a fairly steady rate of student accountability behaviors in reading instruction over time. Teacher B also was observed to use a fairly stable rate of accountability behaviors,

out only in mathematics instruction. A pattern over time emerged in her reading instruction, whereby her mean rate of academic accountability behaviors increased by about three standard deviations from Time 1 to Time 2, and dropped by almost the same amount from Time 2 to Time 3.

When the two teachers' means were calculated by factor across time and subject matter, neither one appeared to be very different from the sample factor mean, and the teachers were within one standard deviation of each other. Once again, possible differences "wash out" when time and subject matter are not considered.

Organization and rules for the classroom (Factor 7). Teacher behaviors such as stating or posting classroom rules and procedures were coded in this factor of the BTOI as evidence of classroom organization and management.

Teacher A began the school year by demonstrating such behaviors rather infrequently during both reading and mathematics instruction, but dropped to zero at Times 2 and 3 in mathematics. Instances of coded behaviors dropped to zero at Time 3 in reading, as well. Teacher B showed quite a different pattern in mean rates of coded classroom organization behaviors. From Time 2 to Time 3 in math lessons, her mean rate dropped a little over 1½ standard deviations. In reading, her mean rate of organization behaviors increased by over 1½ standard deviations from Time 1 to Time 2, and it remained at nearly the same rate for Time 3.

This factor, unlike most of the others, revealed some apparent differences when relating the individual teachers' mean rates of behavior across time and subject, to the grand factor mean across time and subject. That is, Teacher B's overall mean rate of classroom organization behaviors was just about one standard deviation above the sample mean for this category. It was also about one and one-half standard deviations above that

for Teacher A. Thus, in general, the findings suggest that Teacher B exhibited a higher rate of behaviors which could be coded on the BTOI as evidence of classroom organization.

Teaching/presentation of rules and procedures (Factor 8). Behaviors involved in teaching classroom rules and procedures, including the communication of desired and undersired attitudes or behaviors and presenting or soliciting from students a rationale for a particular rule, were included in this factor on the BTOI.

In both reading and mathematics instruction, Teacher A's mean rate of presenting rules and procedures dropped to zero by Time 3 (although her rate in reading was low and stable from Time 1 to Time 2). Conversely, Teacher B was not observed presenting any rules to students in either subject at Time 2, but was teaching rules and procedures in both subjects at Time 3. Also of note is the fact that her initial rate of teaching rules in reading was more than one standard deviation above the mean.

Relative to the factor mean for presenting rules by all teachers across time and subject, and relative to each other, neither teacher's means appeared to stand out as different.

Holding students responsible for behavior (Factor 9). Behaviors indicative of student adherence to established rules and procedures for use of classroom areas and facilities were included here.

Some interesting comments can be made about Teacher A's mean rate of holding students responsible for behavior. In mathematics, her mean rate decreased to zero at Time 2 and remained there at Time 3. Conversely, her mean rate in this factor during reading instruction changed from being well below (i.e., more than one standard deviation) the sample mean at Time 1, to a level within one standard deviation of the mean at Times 2 and 3.

Conversely, Teacher B's mean rates in this factor during both reading and mathematics lessons decreased over time to a virtually identical level (.32 and .30), but at all times was within one standard deviation of the grand factor mean across time and subject.

Finally, the two teachers' factor means were less than one standard deviation apart. Teacher A's mean rate of holding students responsible for behavior across time and subject matter was, however, slightly more than one standard deviation below the factor mean for all teachers.

Reacting to student behaviors (Factor 10). Behaviors such as desist statements and teacher use of consequences to sanction desired and undesired behaviors or attitudes were included in this BTOI factor.

Briefly, Teacher A appeared less consistent in her rate of reactions to student behavior over time in mathematics lessons than in reading lessons. That is, at Times 1 and 2 in mathematics, her mean rates were more than one standard deviation below the sample factor mean across time and subject. At Time 3 in mathematics, and at all three times in reading instruction, Teacher A's mean reaction rate was comparable to (e.g., within one standard deviation of) the sample factor mean. Similarly, most of Teacher B's observed mean rates of reacting to student behavior were within one standard deviation of the sample factor mean across time and subject, although they did decrease by Time 3 in reading to a rate one standard deviation below the sample mean.

The factor means for Teachers A and B across time and subject did not appear to be substantially different from one another (that is, they were within one standard deviation of each other). Both teachers' overall factor means across time and subject were similar to that for all teachers in the study.

Summary of BTOI findings. To recap, the factors upon which Teachers A and B were compared and found to be different relative to each other, or relative to the overall means, were these: academic presentation (the teachers were slightly more than one standard deviation apart, with Teacher B showing the higher rate of behavior); classroom organization and rules (1½ standard deviations apart, with Teacher B showing the higher rate at approximately one standard deviation above the mean); and, holding students responsible for behavior (Teacher A was about one standard deviation below the sample mean).

Summary Paragraphs

A chart summarizing the comments generated by various observers after completing observations of Teacher A and Teacher B is provided in Table 5. Even a quick perusal of that chart reveals a very different tone to the comments relating to Teachers A and B.

Briefly, the comments regarding Teacher A's classroom generally seemed indicative of an atmosphere of lethargy, confusion, and/or minimal instructional interaction between either teacher and students or students and materials ("listless, yawning;" "sleepy...didn't seem to know what was going on;" "students were talking...the entire time in seatwork;" and, "(teacher) worked on her own papers at her desk while kids worked at seats."). In marked contrast, at least three observers made some comment about pacing, movement through activities, and the like in Teacher B's room ("High energy;" "rapidly paced;" "movement from one activity to another occurred with ease").

Another notable contrast occurred in the observers' mention of the teachers' establishment and use of classroom rules and procedures. Apparently, Teacher A made a concerted effort to instruct her pupils on

Table 5. Summary Chart of Observer Comments by Observer ID Number from Observation Summary Paragraphs for Teachers A and B

Time	Teacher A	Teacher B
Time 1	'quiet, subdued" (Obs. 75) "flooded" kids with school, classroom rules on first day (Obs. 75) "worked on her own papers at her desk while kids worked at seats" (Obs. 75) during assembly, "no contact between Teacher and students, including eye contact" (Obs. 89) "correcting Math homework, some reteaching" (Obs. 89) "class was disorganized... Teacher was still acquiring both new students and materials, e.g., not everyone had a book" (Obs. 77)	"High energy, structured, class, even though teacher tries hard to obtain involvement...on part of Ss through questioning" (Obs. 75) "doing seatwork, with teacher circulating (aide also). When teacher encountered a 'common' problem, she would call whole class to attention..." (Obs. 89) "Rapidly placed, momentary transition, minimal 'dallying.'" (Obs. 89) "She was still getting in new students who didn't know the procedures. She would be going slowly...to get them more accustomed to their new rules and procedures." (Obs. 77) "Common questioning pattern when asking about vocabulary or concepts in reading... coded as B7, B10, C1 (questions using concrete examples also related to students' interests)" (Obs. 77)

Table 5. continued

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
Time 2	"inability to conduct meaningful instruction" (Obs. 82)	"Teacher consistently melds procedures with instruction" (Obs. 75)
	"ineffective in reacting to inappropriate behavior" (Obs. 82)	"another clear pattern is the use of sarcasm when reacting to students' inappropriate behaviors" (Obs. 75)
	"reading in Teachers' manual while pupils in groups waited for instruction" (Obs. 82)	"Very rapidly paced...T tries to be as concrete as she can...(and) to use examples related to Ss' interests" (Obs. 75)
	"worksheets were not explained" (Obs. 82)	
	"content errors were made" (Obs. 82)	"Teacher says that just being in the study makes her think about it (instruction) more." (Obs. 75)
	"class was patiently handled" (Obs. 89)	
	"students were talking...the entire time in seatwork" (Obs. 89)	"did not deviate from standard (district program) format" (Obs. 79)
	"Ss became listless, yawning... Teacher used question cues to bring them back to attention. It was effective..." (Obs. 89)	"commented to her Ss in a positive way if they did well in their academic work, yet (not)...when Ss followed rules and procedures appropriately" (Obs. 79)
		"conversed often with her students, straying from subject matter" (Obs. 79)
		"Students understand (Ms. B's) rules and procedures. Movement from one activity to another occurred with ease." (Obs. 79)

Table 5. continued

Item	Teacher A	Teacher B
Time 3	"When kids were doing seatwork, the teacher tended to bury herself with her own preparations and paperwork." (Obs. 77)	"Teacher is open and friendly within a framework that shows she is in charge of the room" (Obs. 89)
	"(kids were) sleepy, yawny, didn't seem to know what was going on" (Obs. 89)	"Students were almost all on-task" (Obs. 89)
	"transition was initiated by the aide. Teacher looked up, almost surprised..." (Obs. 89)	"There was no talking...no movement in and out of the room, no requests for anything..." (Obs. 89)
	"Teacher did not explain or reteach, just kept saying 'no' to wrong answers." (Obs. 89)	"Teacher ran all three (mathematics) groups with instructions and explanations for each, and providing (sic) time for individual attention and accountability." (Obs. 89)
	"Only highlight of observation was sharing time. Even Teacher smiled once." (Obs. 89)	"Most of the time was spent grading papers and several minutes were spent while the teacher walked around with her grade book and showed the students their grades." (Obs. 91)

classroom rules and procedures on the first day of school ("flooded" them). The only other mentions of rules or classroom procedures, or classroom management in Teacher A's room in general, were not uniformly positive: "class was disorganized;" "class was patiently handled;" and "transition was initiated by the aide. Teacher looked up, almost surprised..." Conversely, in Teacher B's room observers noted that: the room was "structured;" the teacher was "in charge;" the teacher took time "to get them (new students) more accustomed to their new rules and procedures," while also "consistently meld(ing) procedures with instruction;" and, "students understand (Teacher B's) rules and procedures." A hint of seeming harshness with regard to rules and procedures may be detected as well: "the (teacher's) use of sarcasm when reacting to students' inappropriate behaviors" was described, along with her apparent lack of positive feedback "when students followed rules and procedures appropriately." It also should be noted that these comments about rules and procedures were generated by observers who visited Teacher B's classroom at all three periods of observation over the course of the study.

A third theme which may be extracted from the observer comments pertains to academic feedback and pupil accountability. Only two mentions of academic feedback were made by observers who visited Teacher A's class: that she was seen "correcting Math homework, (with) some reteaching," and that later on in the year she "did not explain or reteach, just kept saying 'no' to wrong answers." Conversely, several forms of academic feedback and/or pupil accountability are mentioned by observers who watched Teacher B: she "would call (the) whole class to attention" when she spotted a problem which students encountered while doing seatwork; she "commented to her students in a positive way if they did well in their academic work;" and

time was spent "walking around with her grade book...show(ing) the students their grades." Again, these comments were made by different observers across all three observation periods.

A fourth theme which seems implicit in the observer comments relates to teacher activity versus passivity in the classroom--having a "high" versus "low" profile, so to speak. Teacher A was reported on more than one occasion to be working at her desk while the students were in seatwork, and the class was labeled "subdued" and the students "sleepy." She also was reportedly reading an instructional manual while the students waited, and did not explain a worksheet prior to handing it out. One observer noted, however, that she was able to use questioning effectively to regain the attention of "listless, yawning" pupils. Finally, one observer's choice of words seems particularly to reflect a lack of animation on Teacher A's part: "Only highlight of observation was sharing time. Even Teacher smiled once." In contrast, Teacher B was described as circulating while students were in seatwork. Also, more than one observer noted Teacher B's use of questioning with concrete examples related to student interests. Teacher B was described further as "open and friendly," and she "conversed often with her students, straying from subject matter." Unlike Teacher A, who apparently permitted student talk during seatwork, Teacher B's class showed "no talking" during an observation of seatwork.

A final theme relates to student involvement and, perhaps, student attitudes. When observers made descriptive comments about Teacher A's pupils, they seem to reflect a pervasive fatigue, boredom, or inactivity: "quiet, subdued;" "talking;" "listless, yawning;" "sleepy, yawny." Teacher B's students, on the other hand, were described rarely but in terms

reflective of academic involvement: "almost all on-task;" "no talking...no movement in and out of the room, no requests."

In sum, five themes differentiating Teachers A and B seem to emerge from the comments generated by observers on the open-ended summary page. These are: 1) a general theme of lethargy versus energy directed to academic work; 2) the establishment and utilization of rules and procedures to organize the classroom, versus minimal observed efforts in this regard; 3) academic feedback and pupil accountability, versus simple negations; 4) teacher activity ("high profile") versus passivity ("low profile"); and, 5) student work involvement versus lack of apparent engagement. It should be noted that the final two themes are, in essence, subthemes to the first one. They were identified discretely for the purpose of drawing attention to the fact that the atmosphere of seeming lethargy or minimal apparent involvement was not associated solely with either the students or the teacher.

Teacher Journals

Each teacher maintained a journal record of her staff development interactions. The teachers noted in the journal whether or not the interaction was planned or spontaneous, and whether they (or someone else) had initiated the interaction. Table 6 displays the resulting percentages of types of interactions (planned/spontaneous) and of teacher-initiated interactions which occurred in either the teachers' initial settings or their reassignments. The reader is reminded that Teacher A's transfer occurred at mid-October, while Teacher B took a new position in January.

Briefly, the teachers were fairly similar in the overall number of reported interactions in staff development. Fairly distinct patterns emerge, however, in which Teacher B reports having had more spontaneous

Table 6. Percentages of Recorded Staff Development Interactions Which Were Planned, Spontaneous, and/or Teacher Initiated Before and After the Change in Classroom Assignments

	Teacher A				Teacher B			
	First Setting		Second Setting		First Setting		Second Setting	
	within setting	all interactions	within setting	all interactions	within setting	all interactions	within setting	all interactions
Planned Interactions	71.4%	40%	81.8%	36%	26.6%	36.4%	25%	6.6%
Spontaneous Interactions	21.4%	12%	18.1%	8%	27.3%	20%	37.5%	10%
Teacher Initiated	7%	4%	0	0	36.4%	26.6%	37.5%	10%
Total # of Interactions	14		11		22		8	

interactions and having initiated more interactions than Teacher A. These tendencies hold to a degree in both settings for both teachers.

In addition, a variety of themes appear to emerge from the sets of journal pages when considered collectively. For example, one teacher seems to focus more on her students' learning while the other seems to focus more on herself and/or managing the tasks of teaching. Sample comments made by Teacher A over time included: "I'm still nervous [about being in the study];" "I am...discouraged because...I have to learn the system of getting things done, getting organized all over again;" "I hope this will not be too much of a change...I'm dreading it." After the transfer her major concerns were "getting reoriented and familiar;" "when will the new kindergarten teacher be sent to relieve us?...[I'm] fearful that I am unprepared for this assignment;" "I would like to cut my class [size] down;" and "[after two weeks here, an observation] was unfair since I haven't been given the time to reorganize." Once these concerns diminished (about December), Teacher A no longer reported having any particular concerns. In contrast is Teacher B, whose concerns seem more consistently focused upon the students and their academic performance. Comments such as the following exemplify this orientation: "major concerns were best levels for kids according to prior knowledge, kids [themselves],...what's best in classrooms;" "[the] meeting...helped me because it emphasized different things, about which kids have misconceptions;" "[regarding placement of some students] we decide they are very small and can profit from being in the [bilingual] class rather than being quite lost in the fifth grade;" and after a session on child abuse, she felt "more able to cover children's needs...[it] raised our consciousness."

A second dimension or theme on which the teachers seem to differ is the specificity or generality of the journal entries. Teacher B targeted particular learning and teaching problems ("what to do about [a certain child with]...some type of speech defect;" "[poor] language examples in reteaching worksheets;" and "bad items on 'cum' tests") while Teacher A seemed to focus on teaching generally ("the children will retain more [due to the year round calendar];" "we are to roll with it until... [administration] is convinced we need another 'K' teacher;" and the staff developer reportedly "wanted everyone to remain on-task during evaluations").

A third difference occurred in the problem-solving efforts described by the two teachers in their journals. Teacher B recorded 13 entries in which she initiated brief interactions with the staff developer in regard to particular problems (e.g., appropriate pupil placement, inaccurate materials, social/disciplinary questions) which she had identified previously. Teacher A, on the other hand, never reported having initiated a staff development interaction for the purpose of receiving help with an instructional problem.

A final difference occurred in the affect expressed by Teachers A and B toward their new assignments. Teacher A was "very upset," "depressed," "discouraged," and perhaps anxious ("I hope [it] will not be too much of a change for me. I don't know if I will be able to get used to the noise level and distractions...I"m dreading it") or even a little angry ("I still hate starting over"). In comparison, Teacher B expressed mixed feelings: "flabbergasted, shocked, and vaguely giddy about this opportunity," "Will I have to work a lot harder? ... Do I want to leave all of my friends at my own school?"

In sum, the journals about staff development interactions maintained by Teachers A and B revealed thematic differences in: the relative amount of teacher-initiated interactions; the apparent specificity of information; the focus upon students and the quality of their learning; the relative amount of problem-solving described; and the affect expressed by the two regarding the change in assignments.

Discussion, Implications, and Conclusions

Findings about Teachers A and B from several data sources will be discussed in relation to both the four major theoretical/research frameworks and the central questions described earlier.

Information obtained from the demographic and open-ended teacher questionnaires responds directly to the first question about possible relationships between the teachers' personal and professional characteristics, and their perceptions of the teaching assignments held at the beginning of the year. Quite briefly, it seems that in September these two individuals had similar professional characteristics, were in similar school environments, and held similar positive views about their own sense of teaching efficacy and their pupils' capacity for learning.

When this information is considered from a development perspective, the confidence expressed is suggestive of the teachers' stages of concern regarding teaching. Both of these individuals, at least at the start of the year and in terms of their questionnaire responses, had moved beyond a focus upon themselves and perhaps could more appropriately be thought of as concerned with the management and/or consequences of their classroom teaching. In the case of Teacher A, evidence suggestive of repeating the developmental stages with regard to her transfer is available in her journal: from a level of general awareness or anticipation that a change is

impending ("I have a feeling that my job is on the line," she recorded just prior to the start of school), to concern over personal effects of the change ("I have to learn the system of getting things done, getting organized all over again," written shortly after the news of a transfer), and on to management ("I would like to cut my class [size] down," reported the week after the transfer, and "No concerns at this time" about a month or so after the transfer). On the other hand, the comments recorded by Teacher B seem to most consistently focus upon the pupils and the effects of her teaching upon them. However, also consistent with the concerns model, Teacher B appears to have expressed concern over personal effects of the change in her journal ("Will I have to work a lot harder?...Do I want to leave all of my friends at my own school?").

The second question, focusing upon changes in the teachers' classroom practice as a function of the multiple changes they experienced, also can be addressed indirectly through the BTOI and observation summary paragraph data. Although they must be speculative in nature, some reasonable comments can be made.

First of all, in terms of the broad picture, observer remarks about Teacher A seemed generally to be less favorable than those about Teacher B. In conjunction with this is the fact that Teacher A had an "empty cell" rate (behaviors in various BTOI factors which were not observed at all in a given observation) about twice as great as that for Teacher B (see Table 2). This is interesting in view of Teacher A's limited contact with her original, treatment group staff developer relative to Teacher B's full semester of interactions with a treatment group staff developer. However, it is impossible to know whether or not observed overall differences were pre-existing rather than a function of the intervention (no baseline data

were collected prior to the intervention). Another limitation may pertain to the classroom contexts: the "effective" behaviors on the BTOI were established through correlational research most often conducted in regular elementary grades. It could be that the nature of a primary level bilingual classroom is such that BTOI behaviors are not as "effective" or appropriate as they might be in mainstream elementary classrooms. Certain other behaviors, such as holding students responsible for assignments (Factor 6 on the BTOI) and allowing students to talk during seatwork (in the observer comments), also may reflect the age/grade level of the students involved; it may be unreasonable and inappropriate to expect primary grade school children to remain silent throughout seatwork, for example. Another possible explanation is that, because the summaries were written just after observers had spent time coding behaviors on the BTOI, some bias may have been subconsciously introduced into the open-ended paragraphs. Hence, it cannot be assumed from the BTOI data, or the observer comments, that Teacher A was less "effective" than Teacher B (achievement test data relied upon as being indices of effectiveness were not available).

Certain other changes which occurred over time, even when they were not substantial, seem to be logically consistent. For example, Teacher A was observed to increase in rates of presenting academic information (Factor 2) and interacting with pupils (Factor 3) in mathematics from Time 2 to Time 3 (see Table 2), while the rate of seatwork (Factor 5) in mathematics was observed to drop. Common sense informs one that within a set period of time, a teacher may choose to utilize any of several instructional methods, some of which are incompatible (e.g., it would be difficult to have a high rate of seatwork in the same time period as one in which a teacher is presenting information and questioning pupils). Also, Teacher B, who began

teaching the gifted class in January, was observed to be demonstrating a higher rate of teaching rules and procedures (Factor 8) at Time 3 (January) than at Time 2 (a zero rate), and a concurrent decreased rate of use of established rules and procedures at Time 3 relative to Time 2. This seems reflective of both the recency of her change in assignments and her attempts to establish new classroom rules and procedures.

The third question, regarding who initiated the changes in classroom assignments and how the teachers felt about the changes, was addressed exclusively through journal data. Briefly, it was clear that Teacher B had requested the change, while Teacher A was transferred because of shifting school enrollments of children in bilingual education. The concommitant affect expressed by the two accordingly was quite different, and presumably reflects the issues of choice and control over the changes: one "hate(d) starting over" and "dreaded" the change, while the other was "flabbergasted" that she was offered the position. Thus, at the most simplistic level, Teacher B was seeking change in her career, while Teacher A was not. The motivations behind Teacher B's initiating a change are unknown, making it difficult to further interpret these findings.

The fourth major question pertains to contextual changes occurring as a result of changes in the teachers' classroom assignments, and how these may have related to changes in the teachers' perceptions and practices. Information related to this question was found in several data sets, specifically, the BTOI data and observation summary paragraphs (as discussed above), and the teachers' journals. With regard to school contexts, it is possible to speculate that different norms might have been operating in the two settings. Action patterns typical of schools engaged in positive change efforts, as per Berman and McLaughlin (1978), may have been operating as the

informal norm in Teacher B's first setting (including bi-directional communication and shared decision-making, as reported in that teacher's journal pages). It is equally possible that the source of such initiating behaviors resided with Teacher B, as this behavior was reported in both settings. Nothing in Teacher A's journal, however, serves to contradict Feiman-Nemser's (1983) observation regarding school norms which mitigate against collegial interaction concerning teaching practice. Another important point to note, however, is that Teacher A most often wrote about problems which were not under her control (e.g., waiting for another teacher to arrive and relieve her class load), and therefore there may have been limited opportunity for her to initiate staff development interactions of any great utility with regard to the problems she was experiencing. Also, she simply may not have recorded journal entries describing informal interactions which she initiated.

In conclusion, Teachers A and B are exemplars of some of the ways in which teachers may experience change. Teacher A is perhaps more typical of teachers experiencing "top-down" organizational changes, in that she did not request the change in classroom assignments. Consistent with concerns theory, and as a less experienced professional whose expressed concerns were focused more upon herself than her students, she did not seem to interact much with the content provided through staff development (either by reacting verbally in her journal, or by changing teaching behaviors in a manner consistent with the intervention conducted with the staff developer). One also may speculate that she had had insufficient time in the treatment staff developer's school to be able to profit from his/her services, or that the change to another school context, even though similar, was sufficient to render the targeted behaviors less appropriate for use--assuming they may

have been appropriate at all for her instructional area. Finally, Teacher A's relative lack of interaction with the content of staff development may have reflected the irrelevance perceived of that content to her situation.

In contrast, Teacher B may be more typical of career teachers who initiate changes. Again consistent with concerns theory, she had sufficient experience to be developmentally "ready" to seek out changes. Therefore, she was in a theoretically better position to profit from "well-executed" staff development activities, as well as to make the transition to her chosen new assignment with minimal self-concern.

As a final point for consideration, the timing of the changes in assignments may have played a salient contextual role in the ease with which the transitions were accomplished. In the typical academic calendar, a natural break for children and faculty occurs with the winter holidays. Thus Teacher B was able to make her change in assignments during this hiatus, whereas Teacher A had one weekend in October to complete the change. Therefore in terms of simple logistics within a time frame, Teacher B's transition was less rushed, and one may speculate psychologically easier to manage (regardless of the factor of choice) due to the synchrony with the break.

In sum, because of the application of multiple frames of reference to these two case studies, numerous questions for further research into educational practice are suggested. For example, is the timing of a change in classroom assignments with respect to the academic calendar (part of the formal context of schooling) a predictor of the ease of transition? What are the effects of changing teacher assignments, at varying times in the year, upon the students? How critical is the factor of teacher choice in the assumption of a new classroom assignment? How important (and in what

ways) is the particular school/classroom context to the perceived relevance and subsequent utilization of ideas presented to teachers through their staff developers? Why do some teachers bring situation-specific problems or questions to the attention of their staff developers while others may not, and how might such differences in style best be accommodated? All of these questions, among others, are the result of contemplating the cases of Teachers A and B, and could be considered in further research on school change.

References

Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. The Elementary School Journal, 79, 193-223.

Barnes, S. (1981). Synthesis of selected research on teaching findings (Rep. No. 9009). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Barnes, S. (1983). Observer training manual for the Changing Teacher Practice study (Revised, Rep. No. 9050). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Barnes, S., & Defino, M. E. (1982). The contexts of student teaching (Rep. No. 9040). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Bentzen, M. (1974). Changing schools: The magic feather principle. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978, May). Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. III. Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. (1974, June). Process-product correlations in the Texas teacher effectiveness study: Final Report (Rep. No. 74-4). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Christensen, J., Burke, P., Fessler, R., & Hagstrom D. (1983). Stages of teachers' careers: Implications for staff development. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Defino, M. E. (1982). RITE observer manual for use in clinical teacher education settings (Rep. No. 9014). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Defino, M. E., Barnes, S., & O'Neal, S. (1982). The context of clinical preservice teacher education: The student teaching experience (Rep. No. 9022). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Edwards, S. A. (1981). Changing teacher practice: A synthesis of relevant research (Rep. No. 9008). Austin, Tx: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. The Elementary School Journal, 80, 219-231.

Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., & Brophy, J. E. (1980). Predictors of effective teaching in junior high mathematics classrooms (Rep. No. 4069). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983, June). Learning to teach (Occasional Paper No. 64). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, The Institute for Research on Teaching.

Good, T. (1981). Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know (Rep. No. 9018). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. A. (1977). Teaching effects: A process-product study in fourth grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(3), 49-84.

Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. A. (1979). The Missouri mathematics effectiveness project: An experimental study in fourth grade classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71(3), 355-362.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., Jr., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. (1982). Changing teacher practice: Research design for an experimental study. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin, TX.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., O'Neal, S., Edwards, S., Defino, M. E., & Hukill, H. (1983). Changing teacher practice: Final report of an experimental study (Rep. No. 9052). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A., & Edwards, S. (Eds.). (1982). Student teaching: Problems and promising practices (Rep. No. 9015). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A., Hughes, R., Jr., Barnes, S., Carter, H., Defino, M., & Edwards, S. (1982). The student teaching experience: Research design for a descriptive study. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80(1), 36-53.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. (1979). Implementing innovations in schools: A concerns-based approach. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., Jr., & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.

Medley, D. M. (1979). The effectiveness of teachers. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

Stallings, J. A. (1978, March). Teaching basic reading skills in secondary schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, CAN.

Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D. (1974). Follow through classroom observation evaluation, 1972-73. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute.

Stallings, J., Needels, M., & Stayrook, N. (1979). How to change the process of teaching basic reading skills in secondary schools: Phase II and III. Final Report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic Questionnaire

CTP Study

Please complete the following.

1. Name_____
2. Male_____ Female_____
3. Age ____20-29 ____30-39 ____40-49 ____50-59 ____60 or over
4. Ethnicity Anglo____ Asian____ Black____ Hispanic____
   Other_____ (specify)
5. What, specifically, is your current position? (e.g., 4th grade teacher, secondary school principal, etc.)_____
6. How many years have you been in your current position?_____
7. How many total years have you been or were you a classroom teacher?
   _____
8. What level(s) did you teach?_____
9. Where did you teach? (name of schools, locales and years of experience at each)_____
   _____
   _____
   _____
10. Please list the degrees you hold and where they were earned.

Institutions	Dates attended	Degrees earned	Major/Minor

11. How many (if any) graduate credits have you earned beyond your recent degree?_____

12. Are you currently working toward a degree? _____yes _____no

    Major:_____ Minor:_____

13. What other professional responsibilities do you presently hold?____

    _____

14. Indicate the socioeconomic status of the majority of the students in the school you are now working in.

    Low_____ Middle_____ High_____

15. Indicate the approximate percentage of students in each ethnic group in the school you are now working in.

    Anglo____ Asian____ Black____ Hispanic____

    Other_____(specify)

16. Indicate the size of the school you are now working in.

    Small (500 or less)_____ Medium (500-1500)_____ Large (over 1500)_____

17. List the professional organizations to which you belong._____

    _____

    _____

Appendix B

Teacher Questionnaire

Teacher Questionnaire

1. How confident are you in teaching each of the various subjects included in the curriculum?

2. How confident are you in your ability to teach all types of students in your classroom?

3. How confident are you that your students are capable of learning the curriculum taught in your classroom?

4. (a) Please describe student attitudes which are desirable and those which are undesirable in your classroom.
(b) How do you communicate this information to your students?

5. (a) Describe student behaviors which are desirable and those which are undesirable in your classroom.
(b) How do you communicate this information to your students?

6. (a) Describe any long range learning goals which you have for your students?

7. (a) Does your school have defined learning goals for the students?
   (b) If so, describe them.

8. (a) Does your district have defined learning goals for the students?
   (b) If so, describe them.

9. Characterize the amount and kinds of planning for instructional activities and management which you do for your classroom.

10. (a) What factors enter into your decisions regarding methods, techniques, or activities to use in your classroom?
(b) Do you ask students for their preferences or opinions? What other means do you use to determine how students are reacting to class?

11. How much time do you set aside for each of the various subjects and activities in your classroom?

12. (a) Describe the methods you use to assess the various abilities that students bring to your class at the beginning of a new year.

13. (a) How do you make students aware of homework assignments?
(b) How do you make students aware of classwork assignments?

14. (a) Do you make students aware of your grading criteria?
(b) If so, how do you communicate these to the students?

15. (a) Do you call students' attention to unfinished work or make-up work?
(b) If so, how?

16. If you have a listing of rules and procedures for your students to follow, please attach it to the questionnaire.

Appendix C

Barnes' Teacher Observation Instrument (BTOI)

BEST COPY

Barnes Teacher Observation Instrument (Revised)

A. Planning and preparation
1. t. allocates time per academics
2. t. posts assignments for day
3. t. posts assignments for week
4. t. provides calendar with assignments

B. Presentation
1. t. gives/seeks rationale for lesson
2. t. presents new info. or content
3. t. refers to previous lesson content
4. t. uses materials
   a. variety
   b. adequate supply
   c. complete and correct
5. t. divides complex tasks into steps
6. t. gives demonstration
7. t. uses concrete examples
8. t. makes comparisons
9. t. points out patterns
10. t. uses ex. related to Ss interests
11. t. gives directions
12. t. relates new activity to previous or future activity

C. Interactions
1. t. waits for Ss to respond to ques.
2. t. explains "how" or "why" an answer was obtained (process explanation)
3. t. accepts academic comments by Ss during lesson
4. t. accepts content questions during lesson
5. t. accepts procedure questions during lesson

D. Practice
1. t. conducts practice over new material in whole group
2. t. checks Ss responses for correctness
3. t. provides feedback
4. t. moves around classroom
5. t. reminds Ss that they should be working or participating
6. t. reminds Ss that work will be checked

E. Seatwork
1. t. watches class after making assignment
2. t. reacts to Ss not complying with assignment
3. t. circulates as Ss work
4. t. scans seatwork as Ss work
5. t. gives individuals assistance
6. t. assigns extra credit work to more able Ss
7. t. assigns work using higher cognitive levels (analysis or above)

F. Holds Ss responsible for assignments
1. t. makes daily homework assignments
2. t. tells Ss their work will be checked
3. t. tells Ss they must complete assignment
4. t. makes assignments using procedure
5. t. has Ss record assignments in designated place
6. t. requires Ss to keep notebooks to store assignments
7. t. collects assignments daily
8. t. checks/grades papers
9. t. returns graded work to Ss
10. t. communicates make up work to Ss
11. t. relates Ss work to grades

G. Organizes classroom
1. t. allocates time to teach rules and procedures
2. t. states, posts, or writes rules and procedures

H. Presentation of rules/procedures
1. t. provides/seeks a rationale for rules and procedures
2. t. communicates to Ss desired attitude
3. t. communicates to Ss desired behavior
4. t. introduces groups of rules and procedures at different times
5. t. explains rules and procedures in concrete terms
6. t. demonstrates rules and procedures
7. t. breaks complex rules and procedures into steps
8. t. explains cues associated with rules and procedures
9. t. demonstrates cues
10. t. has Ss practice rules & procedures
11. t. gives feedback on Ss performance
12. t. reteaches rules and procedures
13. t. communicates consequences to Ss
14. t. uses materials
   a. variety
   b. adequate supply
   c. complete and correct

I. Uses rules and procedures
1. t. observes Ss behavior
   t. uses rules/procedures for use of materials/areas
2. storing Ss possessions
3. using learning centers
4. Ss use of shared materials, cabinets
5. Ss use of T's desk and area
6. Ss use of drinking fountain/sink
7. Ss use of pencil sharpener
8. Ss use of bathrooms
9. Ss use of out-of-class bathrooms, drinking fountains, office, library, resource room, health office
10. passing out books and supplies
11. telling Ss which materials to bring to groups
12. playground
13. lunchroom
   t. uses rules/proc. for discussion
14. Ss participation in class discussion
15. restricting talk among students during academic presentation
16. restricting talk among Ss during seatwork
17. talk among Ss during freetime
   t. uses rules/proc. for movement
18. Ss lining up to leave room
19. Ss coming and going to other areas of school
20. Ss movement into and out of groups
21. Ss leaving seats during academic presentation
22. Ss leaving seats during seatwork
23. Ss leaving seats during free time
   t. uses rules/proc. for assignments
24. Ss getting t. attention for help
25. Ss turning work in
26. handing back assignments
27. Ss making up work
28. Ss activities after seatwork is finished
   t. uses rules/procedures for
29. selecting Ss for helpers
30. using Ss helpers
31. t. uses rules/proc. for Ss conduct during interruptions and delays
32. t. uses rules/proc. for cueing Ss attention

J. Reactions to Ss behavior
1. t. reacts to Ss not following rules and procedures
2. t. reacts to Ss following rules and procedures
3. t. uses consequences for inappropriate behavior
4. t. uses consequences for appropriate behavior
5. t. reacts to undesired attitudes
6. t. reacts to desired attitudes
7. t. uses consequences for undesired attitudes
8. t. uses consequences for desired attitudes

Appendix D

Observation Summary Paragraph

Summary Paragraph

Teacher No. _____ Date _____

School 73 Page